

10 10/643,548 NGC-149/000196-199

**Remarks**

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

**Specification objections**

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to as not being adequately descriptive. A new Abstract is submitted that is more descriptive and is believed to be in compliance with the requirements for an abstract. Thus, it is believed that this objection is overcome.

The specification was objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 for not providing adequate disclosure to support the single-means claims 1-13. This objection to the specification is rendered moot in view of the amendment of claim 1 whereby claim 1 no longer arguably constitutes a single means claim.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. More specifically, independent claims 1, 14 and 19 used the term "radar based" which was alleged to be indefinite and unclear in context. Further, these independent claims contained "radar based application programmable waveform generator component" which was alleged to be indefinite for containing so many modifiers in a row that it was not clear what was meant. All of the claims have been amended to remove these two specified phrases. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is now moot.

11

10/643,548 NGC-149/000196-199

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It is believed that this rejection is also based on the single means objection raised with regard to the specification, i.e. that claim 1 contains a single means. Claim 1 is amended to the longer arguably comprise a single means format type of claim, and hence this rejection is overcome.

Claims 14-20 were indicated to be allowable if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As noted above with regard to the rejection of claims 1-20, the two phrases that were found to be unclear have been deleted from all claims. Thus, it is believed that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles L. Warren  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,407

Dated: January 4, 2004

PATTI & BRILL, LLC  
Customer Number 32205